

Application No. 10/000,150
Amendment "E" dated April 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed March 23, 2006

REMARKS

The Office Action, mailed March 23, 2006, considered and rejected claims 1-45.¹ It will be noted, however, that claims 1-10 and 43-45 were found allowable, but for minor issues under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

By this paper, claim 1 has been amended to fix the asserted indefiniteness. In particular, the offensive language, comprising: "or other similar processing devices," has been deleted from the claim, thereby rendering the §112 rejection to claim 1 moot. Inasmuch as there are no other rejections of record to claim 1, claim 1 should now be found in immediate condition for allowance, along with all of its corresponding dependent claims (2-10 and 43-45).

The remaining claims have been cancelled to expedite the issuance of the allowed claims. It will be appreciated, however, that this does not evince any intent to surrender the claimed subject matter found in claims 11-42. Instead, this claimed subject matter will be pursued in a continuation claiming priority to this current application.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims (1-10 and 43-45) are neither anticipated by nor made obvious by the art of record and are ready for immediate allowance. In the event that the Examiner finds and remaining impediment to a


¹ Claims 21-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as purportedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for indefiniteness. Claims 11, 14-16, 18-24, 27, 29-35 and 38-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imajima et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,211,901) and also over Colbath (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,776). Claim 12-13, 17, 25-26, 28 and 36-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Imajima and Colbath, which is described above, and also over Yuen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,687,906). Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Application No. 10/000.150
Amendment "E" dated April 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed March 23, 2006

prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 14 day of April, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973

RDN:JCJ:ppa
PPA0000003073V001